

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 PROTEMPO LIMITED, et al.,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 G.A.E.M.S., INC., et al.,

14 Defendants.

CASE NO. C21-1337JLR

ORDER STRIKING ANSWER

15 On March 14, 2022, the court granted Plaintiffs Protempo Limited and Protempo  
16 US Limited's (collectively, "Protempo") motion for default against Defendant DWG  
17 Holding Company, LLC ("DWG"). (Default Order (Dkt. # 24).) The court found that  
18 Protempo's motion was supported by an accompanying declaration demonstrating  
19 "DWG's failure to plead or otherwise respond in a timely manner after being served in  
20 accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 and being notified more than fourteen (14) days prior  
21 to the filing of the [m]otion." (*Id.* at 1.) DWG answered the complaint on March 20,  
22 2022. (Answer (Dkt. # 25).) It did so, however, without moving to set aside the court's

1 entry of default, Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(c), or seeking the court's leave to answer the  
2 complaint after the time for doing so had expired, Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(B). (*See*  
3 *generally* Dkt.)

4 Accordingly, the court STRIKES DWG's answer (Dkt. # 25). This order is  
5 without prejudice to DWG filing a motion to set aside the order of default and for leave  
6 to file an untimely answer.

7 Dated this 23rd day of March, 2022.

8  
9 

10 JAMES L. ROBART United  
11 States District Judge  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22